

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13-21, and 23-25 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over RFC 1738 “Uniform Resource Locators (URL)” 1994 (herein “RFC 1738”) and further in view of U.S. patent 6,275,490 to Mattaway et al. (herein “Mattaway”), U.S. patent 5,943,365 to Long et al. (herein “Long”), U.S. patent 6,512,525 to Capps et al. (herein “Capps”), and U.S. patent 5,764,736 to Shachar et al. (herein “Shachar”). Claims 7-8, 17-19, and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mattaway and further in view of RFC 1738, Long, Capps, and Shachar. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mattaway further in view of Long, Capps, and Shachar. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mattaway and further in view of U.S. patent 5,732,133 to Mark, Long, Capps, and Shachar. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mattaway and further in view of U.S. patent 4,585,904 to Mincone et al. (herein “Mincone”), Long, Capps, and Shachar. Claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mattaway and further in view of U.S. patent 5,835,724 to Smith, Long, Capps, and Shachar.

Addressing the above-noted rejections, each of those rejections is traversed by the present response.

Initially, applicants note each of the independent claims is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, the claims now clarify that the first communication mode, which connects to a server apparatus through the internet, is “used to obtain the text using tags having the embedded telephone number and the communication method designation”. The claims also clarify that the second communication mode that

connects to a telephone apparatus only through a secured public telephone network, bypassing the internet, uses “the telephone number obtained in the first communication mode”.

According to features clarified in the claims, and with reference to Figures 1-5 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, a user, for example of the PC 1, can connect through the internet 4 to an IP server 5. As discussed in the present specification with respect to Figures 1-5, the user of PC 1 can then download from that IP server 5 a web page, such as shown in Figure 4 in the present specification. Further, the downloaded information can include a telephone number as a link destination. For example the IP server 5 can download to the PC 1 a telephone number of the fax-information providing apparatus 7, the telephone set 8, the PC-communication host computer 9, the voice-mail handling apparatus 10, etc. The PC 1 can then utilize that information to directly connect to any of those elements 7-10 through the public telephone network 2, which can provide a secure connection.

Thus, with such an operation a user at the PC 1 can obtain a number of a telephone communication link from the IP server 5 to then connect with another device through a secure public telephone network 2.

Such a structure and operation in the claimed invention provides a benefit that a user at the PC 1 can access a web page through an IP server 5, but then if a secured communication link is desired the user at the PC 1 can obtain information of a telephone number for that secure communication from the IP server 5 embedded in text tags from the IP server 5.

The above-noted features clarified in the claims are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

More particularly, none of the applied art to the RFC 1738, Mattaway, Long, Capps, and Shachar teach or suggest the above-noted features.

The reference RFC 1738 is cited to teach a language usable for describing link locations. Mattaway is cited to disclose a system having HTML tags with an encoded destination link. Long is cited to disclose a computer having a first communication mode connecting to a server apparatus through the internet and a second communication mode connecting to a telephone apparatus via secured public telephone network.

However, none of the above-noted references teach or suggest features as clarified in the claims in which that first communication mode connecting to a server through the internet provides text using tags that have embedded therein a telephone number and a communication method designation, which telephone number is then utilized for a second communication mode through a secured public telephone network. Thus, the claims as currently written are believed to clearly distinguish over RFC 1738, Mattaway, and Long. Moreover, no teachings in Capps or Shachar were cited with respect to the above-noted features, nor are any teachings in Capps or Shachar believed to overcome the above-noted deficiencies in RFC 1738, Mattaway, and Long.

Moreover, applicants respectfully submit the teachings for which Shachar is cited also do not overcome further features recited in the claims.

The claims further recite that after a communication link is selected a message can be displayed, see for example Figure 5 in the present specification, on a window 31 that includes information of a charge based on a telephone number.

For example in Figure 5 the information includes a statement such as “The Charge For A Telephone Call Is \$XX.XX/MINUTE.” In the claimed invention the charge for a telephone call can be computed by the CPU 12 from the telephone number, and information of such a computed charge can be displayed for a user.

The above-noted feature recited in the claims is believed to further clearly distinguish over the applied art. That is, none of the cited art teaches or suggests the noted information including “communication charge information based on said telephone number”.

The outstanding rejection now newly cites Shachar to disclose the above-noted feature. However, Shachar merely discloses at the noted column 12, lines 1-11 that a service button can be utilized that indicates a phone number to be called, “related charges, if any”, etc. However, at no point does Shachar disclose such “related charges” as the actual cost for a charge of a telephone call. As noted above, one feature in the claims is to specifically provide a display of a specific charge for a telephone call. The mere mention of “related charges, if any” in Shachar is not directed to such a feature. In fact, Shachar merely discloses the use of a service tag provided in conjunction with an electronic business card, and Shachar does not indicate displaying a specific charge for a telephone call based on a selected telephone number. Thus, Shachar is not believed to teach the above-noted feature further recited in the claims.

In view of these foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit the claims as currently written distinguish over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
BDL/SS:aif

I:\ATTY\SNS\20's\203071\203071US-AM2.DOC